

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VINCENT ESPINOSA,

Plaintiff,

v.

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:24-cv-00294-KES-CDB

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED
FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDERS AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE

TWO-DAY DEADLINE

(Doc. 8)

On April 25, 2024, Plaintiff Vincent Espinoza filed a notice of settlement of his claims against Defendant Ford Motor Company. (Doc. 7). The following day, the Court directed the parties to file dispositional documents by no later than May 17, 2024, or at least five (5) days before that date, show cause to extend the time for filing dispositional documents pursuant to Local Rule 160(b). (Doc. 8). The deadline to file dispositional documents has passed and the parties failed to make any filing consistent with the Court's order.

Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions ... within the inherent power of the Court." Further, the Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir.

2000).

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **within two (2) days of entry of this Order**, the parties jointly shall show cause in writing why sanctions – up to and including financial sanctions and dismissal of the action – should not be imposed for their failure to comply with the Court’s orders and failure to prosecute the action. In the alternative, the parties may comply with this Order by filing the requisite dispositional documents by that same deadline.

Failure to comply with this Order will result in the imposition of sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 20, 2024


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE